



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,187	06/27/2001	Gordon Brent Vikse	14088	3901
21186 7.	590 01/06/2006		EXAM	INER
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH			CAI, WAYNE HUU	
1600 TCF TOV 121 SOUTH E	VER IGHT STREET		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLI	IS, MN 55402		2681 DATE MAILED: 01/06/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/893,187	VIKSE ET AL.	•			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Wayne Cai	2681				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 12 December 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THI	S APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.				
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the following the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: The period for continued and marths from the mailing of the period for continued and the period of the following time period for continued and the period of the following time period for continued and the period of the following time period o	owing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in liance with 37 CFR 1.114. The repl	ffidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or			
a) In the period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no						
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened stabove, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS						
	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f will not be entered	herause			
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in began appeal; and/or 		educing or simplifying	the issues for			
	(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324)			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s			. (1 102 02 1).			
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>None</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to: <i>None</i> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>10,12-23,28-30 and 35-55</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe ry and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11 M The request for reconsideration has been considered by	it door NOT place the application :	n condition for all according	nno hoosyssy			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.			ince pecause;			
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Although independent claim 10 is amended in which it is consistent with all other searched independent claims, the Examiner would not enter this amendment since it is amended after Final Office Action.

In response to the Applicant's statement "claim 10 has been amended to make it clear that code is first downloaded to a first memory, then the device is rebooted, the code is detected during the reboot, and then it is burned into the programmable memory." The Examiner respectfully requests the Applicant to point out where in the claim the Applicant recites the exact order of how each step should be carried out. Therefore, the Examiner provides prior arts where they are indeed in combination teach all the recited limitations without any specific orders.

The Applicant also asserts that independent claims 18, 21, 28, 44, and 47 recite "two reboots or restarts of the computer for the code to be properly written to the correct memory." The Examiner agrees; however, Hoffman does teach restart, reboot, or shut down the local computer (see paragraph 0027). Since the Applicant solely recites the rebooting or restarting step twice; there is no way the Examiner or one skilled in the art would know exactly why two rebooting or restarting steps are needed. Therefore, as long as the prior arts teach the rebooting or restarting step, it could broadly read on both claimed limitations.

The Applicant further argues that the cited art does not teach "reboot to load it from one memory into another memory as claimed." This is not what is being claimed. In the claim, the Examiner could not even find where the Applicant suggests one skilled in the art to reboot to load from one memory into another memory, even though the Applicant does recites "a first memory" and "programmable memory". Hoffman does teach the first memory (i.e., random access memory or RAM) (see column 13, lines 26-32). Hoffman even further teaches burning the code segment into the programmable memory (i.e., flash memory) (see column 12, lines 19-36, and column 13, lines 26-32). Clearly, Hoffman teaches both limitations. The Examiner, however, could not identify where in the claim the Applicant requires or suggests one skilled in the art to reboot to load from one memory into another memory.